

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application. At the time of the outstanding Office Action, March 3, 2009, claims 40-71 were pending. By this Response claims 40, 54, and 68-70 are amended, and claims 47 and 57 are canceled. No new matter has been added. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with appropriate status identifiers.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 40-41, 54-55 and 68-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,388 to Franz *et al.* (Franz) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,444,817 to Takizawa (Takizawa). Claim 70 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franz in view of Takizawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,614,797 to Hippelainen (Hippelainen). Claims 42-47, 57-62 and 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franz in view of Takizawa as applied to claim 40 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,013,267 to Huart *et al.* (Huart). Claims 51-53 and 63-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franz and Takizawa as applied to claims 40 and 54 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,827 to McDonald (McDonald). Claims 49-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franz and Takizawa and Huart as applied to claims 40 and 54 and further in view of McDonald. Claims 40-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Franz and Takizawa as applied to claims 40 and 54, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,652 to Cox *et al.* (Cox). Claims 47 and 57 have been canceled making their rejection moot. Concerning the remaining claims, because the cited art does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of the instant claims, Applicant traverses.

The packet combine unit, system and methods of the instant claims combine every real-time communication packet, generated by a communication terminal, which contain a portion of a clause unit, determined by the voice recognizer unit, into a single packet.

The cited art does not teach or suggest this feature. The Office Action cites to the clause combining unit of Franz as disclosing a packet combine unit. (Office Action, page 3 line 18 – page 4 line 1.) However, the clause combining unit of Franz merely receives text data, which may have been divided into clauses, of a second language translated from a first language and combines the text data into a sentence in the second language. (Abstract, Col 8, lines 35-46, col. 9, lines 15-28 and col. 11, lines 18-29.) Franz makes no mention of packets, much less real-time communication packets. Consequently, Franz does not teach or suggest a packet combine unit which combines every real-time packet associated with a determined clause unit into a single packet.

Nor are the deficiencies of Franz cured by Takizawa. Takizawa merely discusses a speech recognition apparatus. (Abstract) Takizawa makes no mention of a combining unit, much less a combining unit which combines every real-time packet associated with a determined clause into a single packet.

Neither is the packet combining unit, system and methods of the instant claims taught or suggested by Huart, McDonald nor Cox as discussed in the previous Office Action Response, filed December 16, 2008. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the instant claims define over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the instant rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 5, 2009

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By

Thomas J. Belcher Reg. No. 43,438
for George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072